

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 2 and 8 are cancelled, and claims 12-13 are added. Claims 1, 3-7, and 9-11 remain in this application as amended herein. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-7, and 9-13 are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

Claims 3 and 9 have been amended solely to have the claims better conform to the requirements of U.S. practice. None of these amendments is intended to narrow the scope of any of these claims, and no new matter has been added by these amendments.

In the Office Action, claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Shusuke (Japanese Publication No. JP 11-289503). Claims 2 and 8 are cancelled. Applicants submit that the remaining claims are patentably distinguishable over the relied on sections of Shusuke.

Independent claims 1, 6, and 7 have been amended to more clearly show the differences between the claimed features and the relied on art. No new matter has been added by these changes. Support for these changes is found at, e.g., Figs. 5 and 8-10, page 18 line 27 – page 19 line 3, and page 25 line 15 – page 29 line 12 of the specification.

As amended herein, claim 1 recites:

the means for extracting *extracts packets of SI (Service Information) from each of the plurality of transport streams, reconstructs the extracted packets of SI as new SI packets, and adds the new SI packets to the reconstructed one transport stream.*

(Emphasis added.) The relied on sections of Shusuke neither disclose nor suggest reconstructing extracted packets of SI (extracted from each of a plurality of transport streams) as new SI packets. Moreover, the relied on sections of Shusuke neither

disclose nor suggest adding new SI packets (extracted from each of a plurality of transport streams and reconstructed as new SI packets) to a reconstructed one transport stream.

Rather, such sections of Shusuke merely describe that transmission control information about a received stream is extracted from a received broadcasting signal, a receiving stream is restored based on this transmission control information, and output-control information about an output of a multiplex means is acquired based on the transmission control information. (See ¶¶ [0017]-[0019] and claims 1, 2, and 8.) These sections are not concerned with reconstructing extracted packets of SI as new SI packets, and these sections are not concerned with adding such reconstructed SI packets to a reconstructed one transport stream.

It follows, for at least the above reasons, that the relied on sections of Shusuke do not disclose or suggest the combination defined in claim 1 and therefore do not anticipate the claim.

Independent claims 6 and 7 each call for features similar to those set out in the above excerpt of claim 1. Each of these claims is therefore patentably distinguishable over the relied on sections of Shusuke for at least the reasons set out above regarding claim 1.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1, and claim 9 depends from claim 7. Therefore, each of these claims is distinguishable over the relied on art for at least the same reasons as the claim from which it depends.

Amended independent claim 4 recites:

means for extracting information of a packet of SI (Service Information) from each of a plurality of transport streams that correspond to a plurality of concurrent programs, and for descrambling plural packets using the information of the packet of the SI obtained

from each of said plurality of transport streams and a conditional access module[.]

(Emphasis added.) The relied on sections of Shusuke neither disclose nor suggest descrambling plural packets using information of a packet of SI obtained from each of a plurality of transport streams.

Rather, such sections Shusuke only describe descrambling using a key and are not concerned with descrambling using information of a packet of SI. (See ¶ [0008].)

It follows, for at least the above reasons, that the relied on sections of Shusuke do not disclose or suggest the combination defined in claim 4 and therefore do not anticipate the claim.

Independent claim 10 calls for features similar to those set out in the above excerpt of claim 4 and is therefore patentably distinguishable over the relied on sections of Shusuke for at least the reasons set out above.

Claim 5 depends from claim 4, and claim 11 depends from claim 10. Therefore, each of these claims is distinguishable over the relied on art for at least the same reasons as the claim from which it depends.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

New claim 12 depends from claim 4, and new claim 13 depends from claim 10. Therefore, each of these claims is distinguishable over the relied on art for at least the same reasons. New claims 12-13 call for features similar to those recited in claims 3 and 9 and are similarly supported.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration

and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: August 24, 2009

Respectfully submitted,  
Electronic signature: /Lawrence  
E. Russ/  
Lawrence E. Russ  
Registration No.: 35,342  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTBENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicant

1044268\_1.DOC